ICEAA Board of Director's Meeting

12:00 – 4:00 | Monday, 11 May 2026

Zoom Virtual Meeting

OFFICIAL MINUTES as 10 July 2026

Voting Attendees:

Christina Snyder, Arlene Minkiewicz, Javier Provencio, Carol Dekkers, Brian Glauser, Rich Hartley, Tom Bosmans, Madeleine Teller, Courtney Gray, Cari Pullen, Kimberly Roye, Dave Brown (via Hartley proxy), Irfan Hashmi Kellie Benefiel (via Dekkers proxy), Patrick Casey, Sanath Rajagopal

Non-voting Attendees:

Sharon Burger, Megan Jones, Sean Wells, Kevin Cincotta

Summary:

The board convened to resolve a multi-topic agenda focused on reconciling a loss from a joint 2024 conference, accelerating revenue and certification growth, evaluating potential organizational absorptions, and addressing governance and technology constraints. The board approved a staff-proposed three-payment settlement with SCAF, accepting the immediate first payment and requiring transaction documentation before finalizing subsequent payments.

Finance and reconciliation: staff reported the joint conference lost approximately $30,000. SCAF proposed three equal USD payments totaling roughly $7,628 with an immediate first installment, contrasting with the board's earlier estimate of nearly $17,000. Transfer fees and exchange-rate variability account for much of the discrepancy. The motion to accept the three-payment plan passed with the condition that SCAF provide bank receipts and exchange-rate documentation before second and third payments are accepted; Sanath's vote was awaited before finalizing in one segment.

Training and certification: operations for the current training week are proceeding; a new inflation module will be piloted and a dry run scheduled. Certification metrics show most credential holders have CCA credentials and recertification timing clusters in 2028, prompting agreement to pursue targeted marketing, earlier outreach (up to 18 months), and linkage of conference activities to recertification credits. Staff named Sharon as primary contact for candidate messaging and recertification communication; Maddie and Peter are preparing study schedules, wiki content, and student slides.

Workshops and events: Norfolk workshop results and logistics were reviewed—386 attendees versus a 440 forecast—with multiple sponsors and international/OEM participation. The board examined cost drivers (noting lower Norfolk food costs than Atlanta and continued venue pricing pressure), operational venue issues, and attendee experience concerns. The group discussed

conference scheduling windows, avoiding Easter, Mother's Day, graduations, and requested pricing checks for candidate weeks in 2028.

Strategic positioning and revenue: participants emphasized urgent need for revenue growth, identifying certification as the primary revenue engine. Content gaps were noted in contract pricing and economic analysis modules; participants proposed repackaging updated modules as certifications. Marketing capability and IT limitations were repeatedly identified as critical blockers to scaling revenue (bulk licensing, paywalled archives, secure authentication). The board favored hiring external consultants for marketing and IT but debated budget constraints and lower-cost alternatives (university partnerships, volunteers, in-kind help). They agreed to solicit cost and scope estimates for consultants and IT assessments.

Potential absorptions and partnerships: the imminent bankruptcies of Performance Management and a separate EVM organization were discussed as possible "new homes" for their members/programs. The board weighed strategic fit, liability, and workload risks of absorbing these groups versus pursuing adjacent markets (automotive, OEM, contract pricing). Participants raised concerns about unknown EVM finances and the need for executive committee clarification on what those groups seek.

Governance and bylaws: the group reviewed chapter officer term-limit impacts, the international board petition nomination pathway, and the timing of bylaw changes relative to elections. Concerns about petition candidates bypassing nominating-committee vetting prompted discussion of requiring petition candidates to meet equivalent qualifications or to be allowed only after committee rejection. The board committed to refine amendment language and to circulate a SurveyMonkey vote on the proposed petition restriction.

Operations and technology: recurring operational issues included server and software stability, recent outages, and the inability of current volunteer staff to support scale. The board agreed that IT improvements are necessary for expiring access, paywalls, and corporate licensing capabilities and assigned exploration of external IT resources with defined deliverables and modest initial cost. Megan was thanked for interim website maintenance.

Other operational items: the board discussed modifying the contractual per diem room block requirement (30%) to improve hotel bids, proposing a one-year trial and parallel RFPs with and without the clause and adding post-workshop per diem usage surveys. They are also committed to creating three SCEC committees from volunteer responses, to solicit additional volunteers, to roll Federal CIO Council work into marketing initiatives, and to prepare a nomination information session. The next full board meeting was scheduled as a virtual lunch on July 10.

ICEAA Board of Director's Meeting

12:00 – 4:00 | Monday, 11 May 2026

Zoom Virtual Meeting

OFFICIAL MINUTES as 10 July 2026

Welcome, quorum count, introductions: Christina Snyder

A quorum is established, and the meeting begins at 12:05 pm. Attendees noted the benefits of an in-person workshop for strategic discussion and accountability despite appreciation for shorter frequent meetings and asked remote participants to report audio issues via chat if needed.

Secretary Report: Madeleine Teller

No comments or edits were suggested for April 2026 minutes, either in advance of the meeting or during. Madeleine reminds the group to please record individual actions and follow up accordingly.

Vote: Motion is raised to approve the January minutes. No further discussion is requested. Seconded and passed.

Treasurer's Report Arlene Minkiewicz

Arlene does not have a financial report to present this meeting as we will not receive the statements from our accountants until next month. She presents an update on the financial status coming out of the ICEAA SCAF workshop. She reminds the group that the joint workshop was in September 2024, with limited attendance at an expensive venue. Due to ICEAA having more liquidity than SCAF, ICEAA fronted more of the funding for the joint workshop. After the conference, there were discussions centered around reconciliation of funds due to ICEAA. SCAF requested that ICEAA investigate the impact of daily exchange rates tracking to when the transactions were made, which Madeleine Teller provided a spreadsheet tracking this information. Madeleine followed up to see if SCAF could meet to discuss it multiple times, as did Arlene when she took over the role of ICEAA Treasurer. Finally, ICEAA representatives were able to meet with the SCAF board, including David Hedley, the treasurer, and Cheryl Latimer. At the last meeting on April 13th, SCAF made a proposal for three payments over time. This slide shows what SCAF and ICEAA paid out, including the total that we expected to receive from SCAF, with the daily exchange rates applied, and the following slide shows SCAF's proposed payment. SCAF identified a number of bank fees that impacted their bottom line, which amounted to the difference between the approximately $17,000 initially identified and the $7,628 they proposed as the repayment figure to be split among three payments, the first of which to be paid immediately.

Christina adds that the delta from the original proposed amount and the amount SCAF countered with seems like more than what could be accounted for in daily exchange rate

fluctuations and bank fees. Madeleine explains that the daily exchange rates did make a significant difference in total, but without full clarity of bank statements and when the money is coming in and out of the accounts this still may not be the correct approach. Additionally, the final conversion of the number at the end is highly determinate upon these daily rates, even with a weighted average accounting for how much was paid at what rate. To her recollection, the delta was less than $10,000, but the bank statements would be the most helpful to ensure full traceability. Arlene is willing to make one more attempt at obtaining the bank statements, but she isn't sure SCAF has them available. Christina points out that we have overlap between the SCAF and ICEAA board, and this is not an act of malice. To her knowledge, ICEAA has a stronger financial position than SCAF and does not want to put an organization we partner with in an untenable position, and recouping ~$7,000 is preferable to recouping nothing, which the group at large agrees with.

Megan reminds the group that this is not the first time this has happened to us, and we need to exercise caution when organizations approach us with conference cost sharing. On the surface, it seems like a sharing of duty in addition to cost, but every decision needs to be made by committee and extends the timeline. Even the initial meeting with SCAF took four months, and then additional time to decide when to put in the call for papers to coordinate schedules. Another consideration is the disparity in cost between SCAF and ICEAA events. The ICEAA workshop is expensive to pay for out of pocket, whereas a SCAF event is typically $0-$50 to attend. To make the joint event with international attendees make sense, it needed to offer additional value, which led to increased costs per attendee. This was likely off-putting to the local base, in addition to non-optimal timing with concurrent fiscal, social, and political events in the UK. We also had an impetus to ensure we could advertise the event during the Minneapolis event in 2024. The board notes that this is more money than SCAF is easily able to expend, even if our opinion is that ICEAA is shouldering more of the financial responsibility.

Arlene reiterates that SCAF has only indicated they will make the first payment immediately and has not yet identified the schedule for the remaining two payments, which Arlene will work with David Hedley to establish.

Christina posits that perhaps we should ask to see their financial statements to get a check of if and when they will be able to pay us. Madeleine doesn't think that it is inappropriate but that we are still unlikely to see the financial disclosures, as we have not yet seen statements even for the documentation of bank fees. She believes Sanath's insight would be helpful here as how best to proceed.

Christina brings up that that in the ICEAA charter when we were founded indicates that we are supposed to have the international conference every four years. By collaborating with SCAF we met a requirement that otherwise would have been more difficult to fulfill and posits how we will meet it in 2028. Megan does not believe that is still a requirement within the current bylaws or charter, and Madeleine agrees that she does not see it in the current bylaws or charter. Further considerations are raised about ICEAA and SCAF's financial positions; although ICEAA may have a stronger financial position than SCAF we need to be cognizant of the precariousness of our own financial position. Outside of this context, we are currently in talks with CPM to absorb their membership, which may also be stretching our limits. There is an additional risk that SCAF may only be able to make the first payment and not be able to pay for the second two installments. Brian proposes adding language that because there is a disparity in what we believe is owed, purely because we don't have the insight into the financials, that we're willing to accept an immediate payment from SCAF and we'll tentatively agree for these next two payments in the amounts of, however, prior to the date of the second payment, we would like to have transparency and also documentation for our bookkeeping. Arlene points out that a schedule should also be determined for the future payments, as there is no current schedule beyond the proposed immediate first payment. The group waits for Sanath to join before voting on the motion.

Vote: Motion is raised to accept the first payment proposed by SCAF, due immediately. SCAF will provide documentation to justify proposed total amount before determining second and third payment amounts and schedule. No further discussion is requested. Seconded and passed.

Professional Development Update: Kim Roye

Kim presents slides. We are down a little bit on renewals from the past few years, but she is refocusing on recertification now that much of the work on the inflation module is complete. We have certifications that are expiring soon, and she wants to start reaching out to those people earlier than we normally do. see in some of the upcoming slides, we have some certifications that are coming up for expiration soon and we want to just try to see if we can pivot a little bit harder to think about how to reach out to those people maybe earlier than we typically do. Christina asks Sean for his insight into what works for WCAC and perhaps Southern California that have a more successful time with engagement and recertification. Does he think it would be too much to assign to the region directors to start nudging their

chapters into action. Sean thinks that with the membership and certification lists, it is not that big of a lift, and they can also help people less familiar with what counts to recertification.

Kim continues that there is no big change to our non-US certification counts. We have administered 73 exams in 2026 so far, compared to 157 exams administered in 2025, and we have 7 PCEA and 1 CCEA exams currently scheduled in 2026. Christina asks Kim to confirm that 2019 was the last year prior to switching to the online exam. Christina notes that people were still using testing at the workshop as an impetus to attend the workshop, and that 2019 had a higher number of exams administered.

Kim expands that when she was looking at expirations of certification to understand who to reach out to first, she saw that 85% of the people who hold certifications have the CCEA, where about 10% have the PCEA. There may be some room there for us to target the more junior analysts that may not sit for both exams to see what we can do better to understand what is stopping them from attempting the exam. 2028 is going to be our largest expiration year for certifications. Kim notes that Sean's approach with WCAC is to reach out three to six months ahead of certifications expiring, but maybe we need to start getting on people's radar even earlier. She suggests that at 18 months we send people a ping their certification is going to expire, and to put it on their radar, at12 months we could provide a list of what units they need for recertification, and at 6 months provide them a bit more information to make all the units that you need for recertification.

Sean adds that the other benefit is that by bringing the need for recertification points to a member's attention earlier, they could plan to go to a workshop, write a paper, present it, and attend a training track to knock out points. Sean wants to revisit people who only take PCEA versus CCEA as he doesn't understand the point of studying all CEBoK to only sit for one of the exams that test for CEBoK mastery.

Megan adds that also to Sean's point is that the certification process is confusing. We must have a flowchart to explain to people how it works. For people who already know what it means, we're doing fine but that is off-putting to people that aren't already part of the ICEAA fold. By making it more complicated it turns off potential new audiences, members, and certified analysts.

Christine thinks that the certification path is a conversation we need to explore, ideally with Kevin Cincotta present. She agrees that when we make the call for papers first may be a good time to start advertising to people with certifications up for renewal to motivate them to contribute a paper or push to attend the workshop, and it creates a targeted marketing

opportunity. Sharon is identified as the key POC for any questions that emerge from the marketing push. Kim will work with Sharon on the messaging. Kim also thinks that targeting managers or higher ups that have many employees coming up for recertification also may be worthwhile.

Action: Sharon will field questions from members and recipients about the targeted certification marketing and recertification requirements. Kim will work with Sharon to draft targeted messaging for certification outreach tied to the conference and recertification points.

Kim briefs the training update for the inflation module. Brian Flynn and Peter Braxton have put in a lot of great work; Brian has focused on the brief that will be presented for the CEBoK inflation module, and Peter has taken the lead on creating the wiki content that aligns with the brief. There was a complete update of the brief, but we still have other goals to which we are working, including finalizing the wiki content and adding additional escalation/inflation questions to the module/exam. Peter is also working on a graphic that helps explain the new inflation guidance.

Kim and the team have been working on communication to test takers about how to be successful in the exam, and Sharon includes that communication when people are accepted as being eligible to take the exam, as well as a notional schedule people can follow for exam preparation. If people are more intentional about study groups and preparing adequately, hopefully success rates will be on par with what we were expecting.

Finally, we have had conversations about the BOE and where we need to go with that product. Hopefully we will get feedback and determine next steps in the coming months.

2026 Workshop Update: Megan Jones

Megan presents slides. The workshop received three gold sponsorships, four silver sponsorships, and 11 other sponsors, of which all but three have booths. Hunatek sponsored our neck wallets, Sirius sponsored the bags, and Take2 will be sponsoring our custom cocktail at the bar tonight, tomorrow, and Wednesday. Our forecast said we would hit 440, but we got 386, which Megan found reasonable, as 440 seemed too high. We had 62 Government attendees this year as opposed to Atlanta's 12, which is very nice. We also got a lot of international attendees from a lot of different countries this time, to include 3 attendees from the Brazilian army, a Galorath employee based out of Germany, many South Koreans, some Taiwanese, a few people from Türkiye, and the Sirius folks representing the UK. We have a strong OEM presence, which we were hoping for as Norfolk is an OEM town. Additionally, food is about half the price as it was in Atlanta. We will feed 386 people for

about the same amount as we spent last year on about 250 attendees. Other wonderful news, the food here is about half the price it was in Atlanta. Megan explains that post-COVID, hotels got rather bullish in their pricing, which presents challenges in choosing a city. Megan points out that since we operate on a cash basis, some of the money we made for the workshop is on the 2025 report. Next year we will be in St. Louis and the call for papers is already up.

ICEAA Strategic Direction: Christina Snyder, Megan Jones

Christina presents slides. She brings up that at the beginning of her term, we discussed the strategic direction that ICEAA would go in, and the landscape has changed even more. After Atlanta, we were nervous and even considered briefly a virtual workshop for 2027. We were apprehensive about Norfolk but the numbers that Megan presented give Christina more confidence for future workshops. However, the expectations of the employees and managers have shifted over the past 15 years that Christina has been a part of the organization. Do we still have the same target audience? Are we meeting the objectives that we originally came up with and should we open the aperture a little bit more as to what the world is, what's available to us, and the idea that maybe we don't have to do it all, we don't have to know it all, there are experts that might be able to help us.

Christina displays bullets from the strategic plan, the top one of which to her is the annual workshop. Even though there were a lot of people not excited about the Norfolk location, we still got good numbers. It doesn't have the totals of Tampa or San Diego, but it's not a destination high on many people's bucket list. Even so, the numbers we got indicate to her that people really do like what ICEAA has as a product, which is this workshop. The second bullet is about maintaining and continuously improving CEBoK with revisions to the current content and adding relevant content. We have done this, with the change to inflation specifically for this year, and we are teaching that at the workshop. However, Christina sees a need to explore more effective ways to curate and constantly expand our body of knowledge, and the way we do it now is a long and tedious process. Modules 5 and 6 both took over a year to update. It would take us 16 years to update all modules, which is not realistic. We also need to maintain high quality certification exams that are passable but still difficult otherwise the CCEA doesn't mean anything. We also need established web-based access to connect members with our resources and especially to prepare them for those certification exams. The final bullet on Christina's strategic plan is about the journal. We're one of the few organizations that still has a peer-reviewed journal that people look to us to come and publish their information. We are a niche career field and there are people who want to get their papers out there.

From this list, Christina considered which products are the most valuable and where are we getting the demand signal from. The annual workshop is the biggest one, but also CEBoK and CEBoK-S, certifications, and the journal. We need to discuss how we can broaden our reach and modernize our products as appropriate.

Sean adds that the archive of papers holds a great deal of value for the members. New ICEAA papers reference other ICEAA papers, which he sees as a positive. Access to the papers isn't something we currently charge for, but he sees the collective body of research and knowledge as a huge asset to the members. Another value ICEAA adds is at the chapter level, particularly at the larger chapters such as WCAC, is the networking and social events. Although it's not a product it is a way to get people in and can potentially feed the other products.

Javier adds that the list is comprised of products we create and output and that another list we should have is generating leads, such as attending other conferences and having a booth and a social media presence. How do we market interest? Is it through a TikTok account? Is it through Instagram? What is it that we can do to feed into these products that we provide. Without having a marketing angle to this, if we go to one of the engineering societies and have a booth, we can potentially pull from their base and have one or two people come and join our organization. Other considerations: How do we get creative with our logo? How do we get creative with making videos? How do we have that marketing strategy to drive folks to join us for the outputs that we generate? These ideas would go on the second list. Marketing branding is what may generate more interest in joining the organization and having people sit for the test. Can we link ourselves to companies willing contracts and plug in data about how ICEAA enabled contract wins? If we can link up with companies like Northrup or Boeing to post with our quotes or our logo included that sort of branding could take us to the next level. Christina agrees with the idea of the second list.

Christina briefly speaks to the organizations that are struggling, such as College of Performance Management and the Naval Postgraduate School. Some organizations are doing okay, and the difference seems to be organizations with Government backing, such as Morris or DAU, which is entirely Government run.

Brian agrees with Javier's statement about how we need to better market ICEAA than we are now. We also need to consider getting an idea of why certain OEMs are getting more involved and how we can see more of that. He also wants to explore the idea of having a 501(c)(3) non-profit designation versus a 501(c)(6). He will resend some information he sent a while back. Technically now when we get a sponsorship fee that is an exhibitor fee, and a

sponsorship fee may be more appealing to more corporations. With the 501(c)(3) status the sponsorship fee would be tax deductible It would also open the doors for pursuing things like grants and other funding sources for developing educational materials, et cetera.

Megan mentions that as a (c)(3) we could also do more lobbying that people talk about to get a CCEA designation added to contracts. Madeleine adds that in her experience, getting the CCEA designation doesn't always involve working with high level leadership but also building relationships and working directly with the Contracting Officer Representatives and direct customers that have a large voice in creating the Statement of Work.

Megan points out that companies with a lot of CCEAs will advocate more for this and bid more people with CCEAs because it is a true metric that can differentiate between bids.

Rich adds that it is a general awareness thing about an organization understanding that putting a CCEA requirement into their contract will serve as a discriminator and increase the likelihood of getting people that are qualified. Typically, when we get a person in the government with a high enough position to see the value of the certification and advocate for it is when we have been successful in the past. Some organizations, such as Air Force, have a list of certifications that they list and it encourages their people to get them, because it helps their career. Megan asks how we plan on getting these high-level Government folks to buy in and support us, because we have been talking about this for years. Christina mentions the Federal Cost Leadership Alliance and how she thought that Chris Massey, Courtney Gray, and Sean Wells had made a good start with the FCLA. Sean sees DOGE as having hurt these efforts, and it's still working even at a reduced level. There have been people within DHS, specifically Coast Guard, who have been able to join WCAC. One issue he has identified is meeting government on their level and where they want to be. We hosted a panel event for WCAC, which got a lot of different contractors out for it, but struggled with getting a federal employee on board, even ones with personal connections to the FCLA. There was a wariness about something coming up that may be perceived as contrary to a mission statement being used against them or their offices.

Megan proposes an idea she had to hire external consultants. She has been at ICEAA for 12 years and has been providing marketing and IT solutions at little to no additional cost. She's able to modify code that she finds online to build things, but the IT infrastructure is not streamlined or easily fixable. We come up with a lot of ideas such as trying to put the archives behind a paywall or give bulk access to CEBoK to companies who want to have ambiguous access to it permanently without unique sign ins that are beyond her IT abilities. We also need to consider how much money do we want to invest in marketing. Do we buy

some lists? Do we hire somebody to come and explain to us what it is we keep trying to do? We have not been able to crack this on our own so far and we need some help. We need to figure out what other pies we can start making money off that won't alienate the government pie or take away from it. But knowing that we can't depend really on the government all the time to come up with money, because it's somebody else's decision that is further up the pipeline than we know. We must hope that somebody who we don't have contact with has money for every one of you to be here. Maybe we can find a market that we can influence and touch and have a little more of a reciprocal customer relationship with rather than just whatever the government is able to give us.

Also, we need to be able to explain what makes ICEAA awesome. What does it do and why is it good and useful. We know this but we can't explain it to people in similar roles that aren't explicitly cost estimators or analysts, such as project managers. Megan sees certification is the engine of this whole association because certification fuels attendance at the workshop to gain recertification points. Membership dues are practically at a loss. If we want to do more things, if you want to have a staff of more than two people that could do bigger things and more things because as is the ICEAA legal department and IT department and marketing department must basically take off the month of April to be the workshop registration department. Additionally, due to having such a small staff, we must rely on volunteer effort and people need to remember it and run with it autonomously.

Additionally, Megan sees the need for a consultant to figure out what things the ICEAA office can do with what we have now so that she and Sharon can start producing things that make ICEAA money. Right now, it takes a year for a group of volunteers to update a single module, because all the volunteers also have other obligations such as work and families. We need to also have realism about what we can do, what resources we have, and who we can reach.

Megan sees the automotive industry as one of the lowest-hanging fruits out there, particularly with the OEM tie and how they still need to estimate things, but she has no idea how to get into that market or if there is another market entirely that we are all overlooking. She and Sharon keep things running, but what is the next most important thing to do and what do we prioritize to keep our organization relevant and above water.

In the context of CPM, they asked us to take over roundtable groups if they are absorbed into ICEAA, and they also have the EVM practitioner's forum that meets nine times a year and writes 15 white papers. CPM's going bankrupt—is this something we need to take on and

how can we expect to profit from those round tables if CPM didn't? And if they didn't, how do we figure out how to make money from that?

Christina adds that CPM has not shared financials, but they have assured us they are going to go through bankruptcy, and we will not assume risks. They are basically looking for a home for their EVM interests. Do we say that we are now primarily focused on cost; we can provide a place for you to present your papers, but we do not have the bandwidth for our board to manage the roundtables and paper production. Is it worth having our name in the ISO, but that isn't a money-making thing and may also increase workload. Christina also notes that she's not sure that there is even an EVM person that ICEAA could give a seat to on the roundtable.

Rich sees the idea of bringing a consultant onboard as having the potential for a lot of value but also a lot of risk. Bringing someone up to speed quickly would be difficult, as we are a niche field and they won't know more about it than we do, and struggles to see the value in targeting, for example, the automotive industry over EVM. He thinks that doing more for compliance and FAR based pricing will bring in more OEMs. Where would we get the money for hiring a consultant and would our time be better spent attracting some of our cousin organizations, such as CPM, and soliciting them for help?

Rich believes that even though CPM is going bankrupt as an EVM organization perhaps their problems can be solved through consolidation, and that we would invest too much time in educating any consultant on our field.

Megan thinks that education will be of lesser import because we currently only pursue one market—existing cost analysts. The point of a consultant would be to pursue additional markets and people outside of our group that have less exposure to what we do.

. Sean thinks that maybe we should be asking who isn't currently failing versus who is. And PMI is still doing great. He wonders if we could have a discussion with them about what they feel has driven their continuing success. He sees that PMI obtaining ISO certification and establishing the standard for project management was the main turning point in their continued relevancy, and ISO certification is something that we may be able to obtain for cost estimating. Sean agrees that EVM is closer to what we do than automotive, because to his knowledge there isn't a huge developmental aspect to cars.

Megan posits who the next group after EVM would be in that case. Even within ICEAA, the EVM community has been dwindling. CPM is down to about 80 members after having a much higher membership for quite some time. Is EVM even a worthwhile market? Sean thinks EVM is low-hanging fruit, and the next low-hanging fruit would be contract pricing.

Megan also wants to make the point that regardless of where we focus our target market expansion, we still have the issue of needing to speak the same language as people we are trying to bring in. We talk across each other using different words to mean the same thing, and that can alienate our audience. Identifying these areas of commonality that we use different nomenclatures for is an opportunity for us to engage people that don't currently realize they could get value from us. Rich reiterates that he believes using the people already within our organization will be more effective for bringing in OEMs.

Christina thinks that we need to figure out the next step with CPM and what caused them to go bankrupt. Was it because they were poorly run? Megan adds we need to find out what they are looking for.

Brian thinks we need to think outside of the box. The Government Contract Pricing Symposium Summit that is essentially run by ProPricer/Deltek used to be huge and may be a bigger draw than the ICEAA workshop. Can we work together with GCPS perhaps? Rich points out they get high end keynotes, but the draw for him is ProPricer, as he has heavy users of ProPricer he sends. Brian thinks it may be worthwhile to consider a booth or other presence there.

Action: Rich to reach out to Charlie Williams to facilitate conversations with the GCPS Summit.

Carol Dekkers adds that Megan has earned our trust in her role over the past 12 years, and she agrees with her about the need for a marketing consultant. We are good at developing cost products, and she endorses Megan's point, but she wants to caution that if we do go down this path, we need to listen to the marketing expert and not override their decisions and think we can do better and polish their product. Christina thinks we need to know what the cost of this would be and thinks that we should investigate it before deciding.

The discussion pivots to hiring an IT consultant. We have a lot of aspirational ideas about how to handle our IP and integrate AI, but Megan is doing IT in addition to her primary duties and does not have the background or bandwidth to implement these ideas.

Cari Pullen understands Rich's perspective about needing to get someone up to speed to be valuable in a consulting role. Cari views the big question with ICEAA succeeding better with

the Government is figuring out how to get certification recognized and/or required in Government training options, even if it is one of multiple ways to meet a requirement. Currently, the only credit Cari has ever received for anything ICEAA related is in continuing education points.

Sanath agrees that we need help with marketing but agrees with Carol that we need to be prepared to listen. We had the conversation several years ago that we need to identify our key revenue source and focus on that. We have multiple products, one of which is certification, another of which is the workshop, and so on. Likely the first thing a marketing professional will do is understand our key revenue source and we as a board need to be prepared not to dismiss what they say and to take action, otherwise it will all be a waste of time, effort, and money.

Kim's concern is that with how nervous we were about even having a 2027 workshop, where will we get money for a good marketing professional to come in and get all they need to do completed in a relatively short time frame. We are all volunteers with full-time jobs currently, so the professionals being paid for this effort will be able to work faster, but money is her main concern.

Megan is hopeful a marketing consultant will take work off the volunteers. She appreciates the effort people put in, but she wants to be able to do more without needing to wait for the BOD and other volunteers to give her direction. If a marketing consultant can better consolidate the message that she has had trouble consolidating out of the board, then she can run with it. She can also run with next steps advised by a consultant and hopefully not need to wait for input or help from the volunteers on who to reach out to or how to refine the market, there would be less churn and more productive work overall. If the volunteers can work on the product and update the modules, and Megan can do the legwork on promotion of the product in parallel, that would be more effective.

Arlene asks if we have considered trading membership benefits to a company for lending us a few hours of a marketing group. They would already know the industry. Megan clarifies that she doesn't need help with coming up with the materials, such as banner ads, et cetera but needs more help with strategic direction. Arlene states that some of the larger companies have strategic marketers on staff. Brian imagines that university students would be knowledgeable in this area also and are frequently seeking projects where they can come up with a marketing plan, design, and implementation. Sean wonders about how we could better use social media.

Megan points out that many of the ideas that we have already come up with require work on the website that she is not able to implement. For example, if we want to see things in our archives it would have to go through a payment processing system, so we would have to have someone who knows how that works and how everything is connected to an ICEAA account and log in. We frequently discuss selling nebulous CEBoK licenses to companies and every solution Megan has devised is not scalable and would fall apart if it became successful. It's not a huge concern that it will take off at this point, but if we become effective at marketing bulk CEBoK licenses, our IT infrastructure will not be able to handle it. She further clarifies that, for example, if Amazon wanted a number of licenses, we would give them a login and now every employee at Amazon could theoretically have access to the wiki, as we can't monitor simultaneous log ins on the same account. Every year a company asks about a bulk CEBoK license where they don't have to specify who is using it and how many people are using it.

If, for example, Boeing wants 300 licenses for 300 people and asks for a code to be used 300 times for separate emails, due to the way the website and wikis are built, that's not really something she can do. The wiki is its own site and has a redirect login once you are in your ICEAA account, and there is one log in for all users although it can't be seen from the user end and nobody has access to the password.

Kevin points out that a better immediate use of our money would probably be an IT consultant to redo the infrastructure and do things we have talked about in the past, such as putting papers behind a wall or better structuring for bulk certification. Brian points out that this also may be something we could ask universities to help with. Megan thinks that spending money on this would lead to better accountability and give us the leverage to demand completion of the work.

Action: Arlene will evaluate hiring external consultants to assess IT, marketing, and revenue opportunities for the association

2028 Workshop — Megan Jones

Megan discusses the 2028 workshop. Christina and Megan inform the group that one of the things that makes us very unattractive to hotels and makes the average member pay more is that we must have 30% of rooms set aside for government per diem. Generally, there are people that are not government employees using this rate and it costs every single person more. Some companies also make people stay off site to get the per diem rate. Hotels will not charge the rate more than what it is on Expedia, but it must be more than government per

diem to make up the difference for the per diem rooms. The is a calculus that the hotels do when we ask for the per diem rate, and we would have more hotels bidding on us without the 30% of rooms at per diem requirement. The difference between per diem and the booking rate would likely come down without that 30% set aside.

Megan adds that the GSA rates are unreasonable. The Norfolk one is $110 and the going rate for rooms at the Norfolk Marriott is $300 on Expedia. Hotels are not excited about selling rooms at the per diem rate, and they spread the loss for the per diems onto the block rate which defers the cost of the per diem rooms to the rest of the attendees. If that spread bumps it above the Expedia rate, they know that people will just book through Expedia and the hotel won't get the credit for it. This is why we don't get to go to cities like Nashville and Austin that people want to go to. Since we can't convince the GSA to update per diem rates to be more realistic, we need to decide if it is worth it for us or if we want to have a greater selection of hotels.

Kevin agrees that we don't need the per diem rooms, because hotels have their own block of per diem rooms that are not a part of the ICEAA block that Government employees can request.

Megan also wants to add that the Government attendees typically wait until the last minute to book the hotel because it takes them time to get the approvals. By this time, the per diem block is already gone, and she can't hold per diem rooms available for people until the last minute. Kevin suggests at least cutting the number of per diem rooms from 30% because that is not commensurate with Government participation. Megan clarifies that the contractors camping on the per diem rates would make it impossible for any Government folks to get a room at per diem, because at least some of the rooms are used appropriately.

Megan wonders if the contractors that take the per-diem rooms would not stay in the conference hotel at that point. Would we lose a guaranteed 30% of the 1,000 nights we need to avoid hotel attrition fees. Last year the 30% wasn't filled until the end of the rate period, because a company that is normally a big offender of abusing the per diem block negotiated their own block rate. This year, they just took the ICEAA per diem rate rooms. Madeleine comments that even getting closer to the per diem rate on the block rate would help prevent companies from seeking out their own block rates.

Megan adds that another wrinkle is that hotels have been outrageously overpriced over the past few years. We could use every advantage we can to get hotels to bid on us at all and we still may not get many hotels willing to host us. We are not attractive to hotels because we

have low room commitment and a lot of space requirements, and we're here for a long time. We are right at the sweet spot because the room downstairs will fit 400-450 people. If we got up to 500 in this hotel, we would have had to move the exhibit hall somewhere else, and we prefer having it all in one spot. We are too big for a lot of hotels. The biggest way Megan sees us to open more opportunities with hotels is the per-diem room rates.

Megan proposes asking her hotel person if she is worth sending out one RFP with the 30% per diem block in it and one that doesn't and seeing if it makes a lot of difference. Thinking back on some of the rejections we've gotten from hotels are due to them not offering per diem rooms, being too busy, or too small. And that is only from the people who take the time to say no, thank you versus not responding.

Christina thinks we would still have people trying to use their CAC cards to get per diem rates if it was less than 30% blocked off, but lowering the number would be okay if it was only the federal employees pursuing those rooms.

Megan adds the hotels say they don't want to do *any* per diem rooms, but they may be more amenable if it is less than 30%. There is also a factor of how desperate they are to book rooms.

Kevin adds that we can try it for one year and it doesn't have to be a forever commitment. Courtney suggests creating some off-the-shelf materials we can provide that show a cost benefit analysis of staying at the workshop hotel and not needing Ubers or a rental car. Christina adds that it's difficult because she uses the Government people staying at the hotel as a selling point to her leadership.

Megan will explore what things open to us with the possibility of getting rid of those. And if it's not opening enough to make the shakeup worth it, then she won't shake it up.

Action: Megan will explore the potential for removing per diem requirements, including asking their hotel contact to issue two RFPs: one including the 30% per diem requirement and one without it to compare hotel responses and rates.

Participants opened by reviewing calendar conflicts for the conference, focusing on Easter, Mother's Day, graduations, and Memorial Day weekend as primary constraints. Courtney had researched Easter dates for the next 12 years and the group discussed preferring late April or early May to avoid conflicts while noting occasional problematic years. The team evaluated moving the conference earlier to late April or early May to avoid conflicts with graduations and Mother's Day. For 2028, Megan will ask for the pricing and seeing if there's any

difference between the week of that would be the 9 through the 11th versus the 16th through the 18th.

2:30 –Bylaws and Officers Christina Snyder, Megan Jones

Christina addresses the bylaws and would like to have a meeting next month with the board on two issues. The first is that there is a lot of work for a professional organization of our size, and we really can burn out volunteers out because we have a hard time finding people willing to do the work. Within I believe it's within the bylaws that people term out of their chapter roles. The problem with that being especially in the chapters besides DC and SoCal, is that there might only be four people in that region that want to do that work. And if that's the case, our own bylaws are stopping people who would be happy to sit there and still fill their president role. Megan adds that she has had several chapters contact her and ask if they can have someone run for another term, because they can't find anyone else to run. She gives them leniency in these cases as it is better to have a three-term chapter president than not have a chapter at all. We can be more flexible with the chapters, but we need to stick with the bylaws obviously for this board. She doesn't think it's worth a whole overhaul of the whole chapter bylaws thing but more acknowledging the scenario with the board's blessing. She would like to continue to encourage the chapters to follow the spirit of their bylaws versus the letter of them to avoid chapters having to close. She confirms that everyone is on board.

The second issue is the petition process that we have. We have talked about this in the past but tabled for a future date on how we handle petitions at the international board level. The board examined the petition nomination pathway that permits candidates with 25 signatures to bypass the nominating committee vetting after the slate is published, traced the provision's origin to the SCEA-ISPA merger, and discussed amending bylaws to require petition candidates to meet the same qualifications or to restrict petitions to cases where the nominating committee rejected a candidate.

The petition nomination process allows any candidate with 25 signatures to appear on the ballot after the nominating committee publishes its slate, which board members view as a bypass of vetting and propose amending to require equal qualifications or limits tied to nominating-committee rejections.

Participants raised concerns that petition slates could be used to exclude specific candidates and described the desire for an inclusive process that avoids a "mean girl" dynamic. They discussed safeguards such as requiring prior rejection before petitioning onto the ballot to prevent gaming the system.

A petition onto the ballot should be allowed only after a candidate has been formally rejected by the nominating process to reduce exclusionary slate behavior.

The group confirmed that bylaw changes can be approved by the board without full membership approval and agreed to refine the amendment language and circulate it by email for a vote, using SurveyMonkey as the voting mechanism. Christina also would like to have a meeting for the nomination cycle for board to answer questions about what it is like to serve and to talk about our individual roles.

Action: Madeleine, Megan, and Christina to develop amendment language for voting and circulation.

Action: Christina to organize a meeting for potential Board of Directors' nominees

Action Item Review: Madeleine Teller

Madeleine reviews the action items and gets updates on all the action items from the group.

Plan Next Meeting & Adjourn Christina Snyder

The board agrees to hold their next meeting in person on Friday, July 10 from 11:00AM-1:00 PM with lunch preceding. A motion to adjourn is raised, seconded, and approved. The meeting adjourns at 3:59 pm EST.